

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 24 and 25 have been amended and these amendments are fully supported on pages 9 and 10 of the specification. Claims 1-27 stand rejected.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 7-14, 17-22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Leary (US 5,950,000). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 1 and 25, the claims recite - "... the property of the custom build rule object associated with at least one value, *wherein said property comprises a command line switch*" and "the tool generating an executable command line *comprising the name of the tool to be executed and one or more properties associated with the tool.*" In order to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. The Office Action appears to assert that the O'Leary reference teaches these features in Col 6, lines 3-25 of the reference, however, it does not.

The O'Leary reference teaches the building of a makefile in Col 6, lines 38-45. However, the makefile as disclosed in the O'Leary reference has as a command line parameter a single parameter – the name of the selected file. In addition, as disclosed in O'Leary, the makefile is a static construct that may not change and may not incorporate new or different elements after the makefile has been defined. In contrast, the instant invention recites a "property" that "comprises a command line switch" and "the tool generating an executable command line comprising the name of the tool to be executed and one or more properties associated with the tool." The O'Leary reference discloses a straightforward makefile process with the name of the selected file and no switches or other parameters on the command line, as is now recited in claims 1 and 25. Therefore, the O'Leary reference does not anticipate the elements of claims 1 and 25 as recited. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 12 and 27, the claims recite "the custom build rule object transforms a generalized command line by programmatically replacing a tag with a property value to generate the executable command line" and "transforming the generalized command

line into the executable command line by programmatically replacing a tag in the generalized command line with the value of the switch property”. Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and thus inherits the claim features of claim 1 as well. Claim 27 depends from claim 25 and thus inherits the claim features of claim 25 as well. The office action seems to assert that the features of these claims are disclosed in Col 6, lines 46-65, however, they are not.

Once again, the O’Leary reference in this section discloses a makefile with a single command line element, the file name. Claim 12 recites “the tool generating an executable command line comprising the name of the tool to be executed and one or more properties associated with the tool” as inherited from claim 1 and goes on to recite “programmatically replacing a tag with a property value.” Claim 27 recites “the build rule comprising a generalized command line comprising the name of the tool and at least one property associated with the tool” as inherited from claim 25 and goes on to recite “transforming the generalized command line into the executable command line by programmatically replacing a tag in the generalized command line with the value of the switch property.” For the same reasons as discussed above, O’Leary does not teach or disclose these features of claims 12 and 27. Therefore, the O’Leary reference does not anticipate claims 12 and 27 for this additional reason. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 13 and 24, these claims recite “transforming a generalized command line comprising the name of the tool and at least one tag into an executable command line by programmatically replacing each tag in the generalized command line with an associated value” and claim 24 further recites “generating a build rule object from the build rule by adding properties associated with the tool to said build rule object and setting the specified values on the build rule object that is to be output.” The Office Action appears to assert that this claim is anticipated by the O’Leary reference, looking to Col 6, lines 3-25 and 38-65 of the reference for support. However, the reference does not anticipate the recited elements.

The O’Leary reference, as shown in Col 6, builds a makefile from which a command line is generated only under direct supervision of a user. The user must decide which elements to chose from a list, then generate a static makefile from these choices with no ability to change the makefile dynamically or to apply this static makefile to multiple projects without user intervention. O’Leary also discloses a makefile with a single parameter of the

name of the file to be executed. The instant invention generates an executable command line by “programmatically replacing each tag in the generalized command line with an associated value” and “adding properties associated with the tool to said build rule object and setting the specified values on the build rule object that is to be output.” A straightforward makefile generation process, such as that disclosed in the O’Leary reference, does not anticipate the changing needs of dynamic software projects and thus has no provision for additional parameters on the command line after the file name, whereas the custom build rule object of the invention does through the use of dynamic and switch property values. Therefore, the O’Leary reference also does not anticipate these features of claims 13 and 24 as recited. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 2, 7-12, 14, 17-22, and 26-27, these claims each depend from one of independent claims 1, 13, 24, or 25. In view of the above, it is clear that O’Leary fails to establish anticipation of these claims. The dependant claims are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons shown for claims 1, 13, 24, and 25. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3-6, 15-16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O’Leary (US 5,950,000) in view of Odaka (US 2003/0140333). The O’Leary reference relates to a GUI interface for programmers to use in building static makefiles for integrating software tools. The Odaka published application relates to a conditional compile environment for use in web servers and web browsers.

The Odaka reference does not remedy the shortcomings of the O’Leary reference as discussed above and, thus, the combination of O’Leary and Odaka fails to provide the teachings needed to establish that claims 3-6, 15-16 and 23 are obvious. These claims are allowable for at least the reasons given above. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2929/303466.01
Application No.: 10/772,902
Office Action Dated: 12/17/2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Date: February 19, 2008

/Steven B. Samuels/
Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439